Remarks

This amendment is being submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 17 2003. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-9 and 30 are allowable. Claims 9-29 are presented for examination.

Applicant requests that future correspondence be directed to the undersigned. In support of this request, Applicant submits the following documents, included herewith:

- Revocation of Power of Attorney or Authorization of Agent;
- Power of Attorney or Authorization of Agent; and
- Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The claimed invention concerns recursive querying of database code objects that facilitates identifying dependencies for database code objects. Information concerning identified dependencies is, in some examples, stored in a dependency graph. While the references cited discuss "object code", none of the references cited by the Office Action disclose or suggest dealing with "code objects", and/or producing a dependency graph of code objects. Thus, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 9-29 and allow the application.

Independent Claims 9, 17, 22, and 27-29

Independent claims 9, 17, 22, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeman (U.S. Patent No. 5,325,531) in view of Shan (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,571). MPEP §2143.03 reads "to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka,* 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). Each of the independent claims includes at least one element concerning a "code object". Applicant submits that neither reference discloses such an element.

While Shan mentions databases, it does not teach or suggest database code objects. Shan clearly omits those elements of claims 9, 17, 22, and 27-29 that concern code objects. Applicant respectfully submits that Mckeeman fails to provide the elements missing in Shan.

Mckeeman concerns a traditional compile/link sequence that produces object code. McKeeman discusses "object code", but it does not teach or suggest "code objects" as claimed in

the present application. Consequently, the combination of McKeeman and Shan is missing claimed limitations, namely those limitations concerning "code objects", and does not satisfy the MPEP §2143.03 standard for a §103 rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 9, 17, 22, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Dependent Claims 10-16, 18-21, and 23-26

Claims 10-16, 18-21, and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McKeeman in view of Shan. Dependent claims 10-16 depend from independent claim 9. Dependent claims 18-21 depend from independent claim 17. Dependent claims 23-26 depend from independent claim 22. As previously discussed, Applicant submits that independent claims 9, 17 and 22 are not obvious.

MPEP §2142 reads "if an independent claim is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is not obvious." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Consequently, each of claims 10-16, 18-21 and 23-26 is not obvious and is allowable for the same reasons set forth regarding independent claim from which it depends. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 10-16, 18-21 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing remarks, the Applicant submits that all of the claims in this case are in a condition for allowance and an indication to that effect is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, if the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner should feel free to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

July 17, 2003
Date

Robert R. Lech
Patent Office Reg. No. 37,169
Attorney for Applicant
(614) 621-7101